

## **Remarks**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Final Office Action mailed May 4, 2007, and are being filed concurrently with a REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.114. A Petition for Extension of Time is submitted herewith, together with the appropriate fee.

### **I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections**

Prior to the Final Office Action mailed May 4, 2007, Claims 1-6 and 21-30 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-6 and 21-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Sarkar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,754,659) in view of Nicholson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,631,519).

### **II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment**

The present Response amends Claims 1, 23 and 30, and adds new Claims 31-34, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-6 and 21-34. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

### **III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In the Final Office Action mailed May 4, 2007, Claims 1-6 and 21-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Sarkar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,754,659, hereinafter Sarkar) in view of Nicholson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,631,519, hereinafter Nicholson).

#### **Claim 1**

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

1. *A system for designing a business process, comprising:  
an introspection module that generates a catalog of generic components by introspecting a set of exposed application programming interfaces (APIs) of a plurality of heterogeneous applications created in different*

*programming languages and transforming a plurality of implementation-specific components of said heterogeneous applications into the generic components of said catalog, the implementation-specific components associated with a plurality of implementations;*

*a component manager coupled to the introspection module and operable to manage said catalog generated by the introspection module by defining and organizing the generic components in said catalog; and*

*a process designer coupled to the component manager and operable to:*

*select at least one of the generic components from said catalog managed by the component manager; and*

*graphically construct a business process definition that includes a series of graphically represented activities linked by one or more transitions wherein at least one activity of said business process definition invokes the selected generic component from said catalog;*

*a repository for storing the business process definition; and*

*one or more process engines that execute said business process definition to instantiate a business process instance, wherein the business process instance interacts with the plurality of heterogeneous applications by invoking the generic components in said catalog.*

As amended, Claim 1 defines a business process management (BPM) system. A process designer is defined which graphically constructs a business process definition that includes a series of graphically represented activities linked by transitions. At least one of those activities causes the invocation of a generic component from the catalog. The business process definition is stored into a repository and then executed by a process engine. When the process engine executes the business process, it becomes a business process instance, which interacts with the various heterogeneous backend applications by invoking the generic components of the catalog.

The advantages of this BPM System include the ability to integrate the various backend applications of an enterprise into one graphically constructed business process, which can be stored, managed and executed by the system. This is an advantageous approach over other forms of enterprise application integration in that various new business processes can be created on-the-fly without altering existing applications, these new business processes can be visually represented so that various users can understand them without learning programming languages and generally addresses the people, application and organizational needs.

Sarkar teaches a method for running existing Java beans in an Enterprise Java Bean Environment. More specifically, Sarkar appears to disclose a system for running application code originally developed as simple Java beans in an EJB environment (Abstract). This is performed

by defining an EJB and generating EJB support code that performs the functionality of the simple Java beans.

Nicholson teaches an automated schema and interface generation. More specifically, Nicholson was cited as disclosing the automatic generation of interface definitions for reducing inconsistent interface and data model definitions. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the Sarkar in combination with Nicholson fail to disclose the features of Claim 1, as amended.

Upon closer inspection, it will become apparent that neither reference discloses a process designer that graphically constructs a business process definition, which is stored into a repository and later instantiated, as defined in amended Claim 1. This feature allows creation of a process definition that includes a set of linked graphical activities which invoke the various heterogeneous backend applications by using the catalog. Neither of the cited references disclose this type of BPM system.

In the Office Action, Sarkar was cited as disclosing the process designer component (Office Action, page 3-4). Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited portions of Sarkar describe a generic EJB created to perform the functions of existing Java beans in an EJB environment. As such, this functionality allows existing Java beans to be executed in a new type environment (EJB environment) (Sarkar, col. 4, lines 20-27). However, there is no disclosure of any graphically constructed process definition, where the activities of the process invoke different heterogeneous backend applications, as defined in amended Claim 1.

Similarly, Sarkar also fails to disclose a process engine that executes the process definition to instantiate a business process instance, as defined in amended Claim 1. The instance invokes the functionality of the various heterogeneous applications of an enterprise. This allows these different applications to be integrated into one process that can be stored, managed and deployed. No such feature is described in Sarkar. At most, Sarkar merely mentions the ability to convert one type of programs to be able to run in another environment (Java beans into EJB environment). This is not the same as the features in Claim 1, as amended.

Furthermore, Nicholson also fails to disclose the features of amended Claim 1. In the Office Action, Nicholson was cited as disclosing the feature of automatically generating interface definitions for reducing inconsistent interface and data model definitions (Office Action, page 3). However, even if that is true, this is not the same as a BPM system that

graphically constructs a process definition, stores that definition and later instantiates it via the process engine. No such functionality is described in Nicholson.

In view of the above comments and amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

### **Claims 23 and 30**

Claims 23 and 30, while independently patentable, recite limitations that, similarly to those described above with respect to Claim 1, are not taught, suggested nor otherwise rendered obvious by the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

### **Claims 2-6, 21-22 and 24-29**

Claims 2-6, 21-22 and 24-29 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-6, 21-22 and 24-29 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

## **IV. Additional Amendments**

The present Response hereby adds new Claims 31-34. The new Claims 31-34 are fully supported by the specification as originally filed and no new matter is being added. Applicant respectfully submits that new Claims 31-34 are not anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references and consideration thereof is respectfully requested.

## **V. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration

thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including October 4, 2007.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 4, 2007

By: /Justas Geringson/  
Justas Geringson  
Reg. No. 57,033

Customer No.: 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800  
Fax: (415) 362-2928